INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Sanders for the helpful and courteous discussion with Applicants' Representative on August 24, 2004. During this discussion it was noted that Claim 8 would be allowable if the limitations of Claim 4 were included. Applicants have amended Claim 8 as discussed.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 8** relates to a flame-retardant curable resin composition which comprises (1) a polymerizable vinyl monomer having a glass transition temperature of its homopolymer of at most 0°C, (2) a polymerization initiator, (3) a reducing agent and (4) **ammonium polyphosphate in an amount of from 25 to 75 parts by mass** based on 100 parts by mass of the total of (1) the polymerizable vinyl monomer having a glass transition temperature of its homopolymer of at most 0°C, (2) the polymerization initiator and (3) the reducing agent;

wherein a cured product of said flame-retardant curable resin composition has a **storage elastic modulus of at most 1,500 MPa** at a temperature of 23°C.

In contrast, Taguchi et al and Parsons et al fail to disclose or suggest a flame-retardant curable resin composition comprising **ammonium polyphosphate** in an amount of from 25 to 75 parts by mass. In addition, the Rule 132 Declaration filed April 30, 2004, shows that superior properties are obtained using the claimed amount of **ammonium polyphosphate**.

If no **ammonium polyphosphate** is used as in Taguchi et al, the flame retardancy is poor. However, adding the flame retardant **ammonium polyphosphate**, not only improves the flame retardancy but also storage elastic modulus, degree of distortion and distortion, and adhesive strength under tensile shear. Such superior properties are not suggested by Taguchi et al and Parsons et al alone or in combination.

If more than 25 to 75 parts by weight of **ammonium polyphosphate** is used (**Test No. 2-7**), the storage elastic modulus is outside the scope of the present invention (1800), the degree of distortion is too high (9.0) and an apparent warp is observed in the evaluation of the distortion (evaluation standard "x" as defined at page 19, last line of the specification).

:

If less than 25 to 75 parts by weight of **ammonium polyphosphate** is used (Test No. 2-6), the flame retardancy is poor. Thus, the amount of 25 to 75 parts by weight of **ammonium polyphosphate** is superior. This is not disclosed or suggested by Taguchi et al and/or Parsons et al.

Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Taguchi et al in view of Parsons et al is believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297

Customer Number
22850
Tel. (703) 413-3000
Fax. (703)-413-2220